

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24, 26-32, 34-35, 40-41, 47, 49, 52-61, 63-64, 66-67, and 69-74 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 are allowed. Claims 20, 34, 35, 40, 52, 55, 57, and 59 have been amended, and claims 25, 33, 36-39, 42-46, 48, 50-51, 62, 65, and 68 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 70-72 have been added. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 USC § 112**

Claims 33, 35, 42-51, and 57-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 33, 42-46, 48, and 50-51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

With respect to claim 35, claim 35 has been amended to overcome the rejection. More specifically, "containing information about operation of the screen body" has been deleted from claim 35. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

With respect to claims 47 and 49, the rejection on claims 47 and 49 is traversed on the basis of col. 6, lines 1-15, which clearly states that OSD generator 700 is activated in response to the user's pressing a key of the key pad 1105. Clearly, the display is powered on, or the key would not function. This is an example of receiving a selection of a function key while the screen is powered on but the OSD is not being displayed, which is basis of the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

With respect to claims 57-60, the rejection is traversed. The Examiner is invited to consider col. 3, line 53 of US 6,346,972, which refers to "externally inputted R-G-B video signals" which are exemplary of the claimed "external color component video signal." After formatting, these are referred to as "first R-G-B signals 701" (col. 4, line 12). They are fed to the

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

pivot circuit 800 (FIG. 3) which outputs "second R-G-B signals 801" (col. 4, line 46). The signals 801 are exemplary of the claimed "internal OSD color component video signal." The rejection of dependent claims 58 and 60 is traversed on the basis of the preceding arguments for the base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

### **First Rejection under 35 USC § 102**

Claims 20, 40, 52, and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,949,504 to Kim (hereinafter "Kim"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 40, 52, and 55 have been amended to include "according to manipulation of a key" or "according to a key manipulation," respectively. Although Kim discloses that the information of the position and direction of the LCD panel according to the rotation of the display viewing angle control motor 51 is fed back to the main controller 41, and that the OSD portion 70 displays the LCD monitor display viewing angle control amount signal in a predetermined position on the LCD monitor 60, Kim does not show any key manipulation to feed back the information of the position and direction of the LCD panel to the main controller 41 and to display the LCD monitor display viewing angle control amount signal in a predetermined position on the LCD monitor 60. That is, Kim fails to show the Applicant's mode signal according to manipulation of a key, as recited in amended claims 20, 40, 52, and 55.

Furthermore, Kim fails to show the Applicant's first image and OSD image as a second image, as recited in claims 20, 40, 52, and 55.

Since Kim does not disclose all limitations of claims 20, 40, 52, and 55 as mentioned above, these claims are patentably distinguishable from Kim, and are therefore deemed to be allowable over Kim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

### **Second Rejection under 35 USC § 102**

Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,115,025 to Buxton et al. (hereinafter "Buxton"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 34 has been amended to include "according to a key manipulation." Although Buxton discloses that the computer can automatically display an interface element 30 and a

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

model 34 on the display 32 according to an orientation of the display 32, Buxton fails to show Applicant's key manipulation to generate a mode signal.

Furthermore, Buxton does not disclose "displaying the first [OSD] image ... on the second image" as claimed (emphasis added). Buxton only discloses an OSD image and a second image that do not overlap. Nowhere does the reference state or illustrate that there is any overlap of the "model" 34 and the menu 30. Thus, there is no anticipation.

Since Buxton does not disclose all limitations of claim 34 as mentioned above, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Buxton, and is therefore deemed to be allowable over Buxton. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

### **Third Rejection under 35 USC § 102**

Claims 34-39, 45-46, 61-62 and 67-68 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,134,390 to Kishimoto (hereinafter "Kishimoto"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 36-39, 45-46, 62 and 68 have been canceled, and the rejection is moot.

Claims 34 and 35 have been amended to include "according to a key manipulation." It is respectfully submitted that although Kishimoto shows a mixed or superposed image 53 or character information 51, 63, and 68 and image 65 on display screens 63 and 67 according to operations of a rotation actuation control unit 901, detecting circuits 903 and 904, Kishimoto fails to show Applicant's key manipulation to generate a mode signal to display an OSD at a rotated position, as recited in amended independent claims 34 and 35.

Furthermore, Kishimoto fails to show the Applicant's first image and OSD image as a second image displayed on the first image, as recited in independent claims.

Since Kishimoto does not disclose all limitations of claims 34 and 35 as mentioned above, these claims are patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto, and are therefore deemed to be allowable over Kishimoto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 61 and 67 are also deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

**First Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 21-29, 32, 54 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,632 to Register (hereinafter "Register"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, claim 20 is argued above to be allowable and therefore its dependent claims are believed likewise to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 21-29 and 32 are deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency.

Second, claims 52 and 40 are argued above to be allowable and therefore their dependent claims are believed likewise to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 54 and 66 are deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency.

Third, the Examiner relied upon Register for its toggle switch that rotates the image and asserts that this teaching would have been applied by one skilled in the art to Kim. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kim rotates its image by rotating the LCD monitor 60: it already has rotation, and it has the only rotation that it needs. If Register's toggle switch were added to rotate the image about a normal to the monitor 60, no benefit would result. The Examiner is no doubt aware that cameras can be held in landscape or portrait position, and that the viewfinder or screen *automatically* adjusts to this change. Kim's camcorder, when rotated, will still show a suitable image in the monitor 60. Furthermore, a camcorder recording is typically shown on a TV or similar device, and rotating the camera would cause vertigo in the viewers, so it is seldom done. Therefore, the person of ordinary skill would not have combined the references.

Because the Examiner relies on Register for all the features of claims 21-29, 32, 54, and 66, and the references are not combinable, the subject matter of these claims is not reached.

Also, any of Kim and Register do not disclose the first image and second image as recited in the Applicant's claims.

Claim 54 recites function keys on a rotatable screen body. Such keys would be very awkward on the rotatable screen body of Kim. Claim 25 has been canceled.

Since claims 21-24, 26-29, 32, 54 and 66 are not obvious over Kim further in view of "Register," claims 21-29, 32, 54 and 66 are deemed to be allowable. Accordingly, rejection on these claims is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

### **Second Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,289 to Sakamoto et al. (hereinafter "Sakamoto").

First, the applicant respectfully traverses on the ground that claim 20 is argued above to be allowable and therefore its dependent claims are believed likewise to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 30 and 31 are deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency.

Second, the Applicant also respectfully traverses the assertion that it would have been obvious to combine the references so that Kim could display in a different mode. In comparison to Kim, the display of Sakamoto rotates about a different axis of rotation for a different purpose. With respect, the Examiner has presented no specific advantage based in the prior art or the general knowledge in the field, as to why the references should have been combined. Since 30 and 31 are not obvious over Kim further in view of "Sakamoto," claims 30 and 31 are deemed to be allowable. Accordingly, rejection on these claims is earnestly solicited.

### **Third Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 41, 53, 56, 63, and 69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, and further in view of Kishimoto.

This rejection is traversed at least on the basis of dependence from independent claims which are argued above to be allowable.

Claim 63 recites displaying a first image in a center of a rotated screen. The Applicant reiterates the argument above for claim 61: that Kishimoto only illustrates off-center OSDs on the screen, and Kishimoto's OSD remains at the same position relative to the screen.

In regard to claim 69, the Applicant reiterates the arguments above, i.e., that Kishimoto converts "in accordance with" display area shape and dimension, while claim 63 generally recites that an OSD of a first image "indicates" a size of a second image. While the reference discloses "accordance," the Applicant's claims recite "indicates," which is a much more specific term. Since 41, 53, 56, 63, and 69 are not obvious over Kim further in view of "Kishimoto," claims 41, 53, 56, 63, and 69 are deemed to be allowable. Accordingly, rejection on these

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

claims is earnestly solicited.

**Fourth Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claim 44 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto, and further in view of Kishimoto. Claim 44 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

**Fifth Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 54 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, and further in view of Register.

This rejection is traversed at least on the basis of dependence from independent claims which are argued above to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 54 and 66 are deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency, and thus withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

**Sixth Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 64 and 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto, and further in view of Register. Claim 65 has been canceled.

With respect to claim 64, this rejection is traversed at least on the basis of dependence from independent claim which is argued above to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 64 is deemed to be allowable at least due to its dependency, and thus withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

**Sixth Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 57-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As mentioned above regarding claim 20, Kim fails to disclose the Applicant's first and second images and manipulation of a function key or a key manipulation, respectively, as recited in independent claims 57 and 59. Since Kim fails to show all limitations of claim 57 and 59, claims 57 and 59 are distinguishable patentable, and are deemed to be allowable.

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

Also, claims 58 and 60 are also deemed to be allowable at least due to their dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

**New claims**

New claims 70-72 have been added. Support for the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification, for example, FIG. 3, col. 6, lines 1-24, and col. 7, lines 25-36. Prior art references of record fail to show the Applicant's first image, OSD image as a second image simultaneously displayed on the first image, and rotation of the second image with respect to the screen body according to a mode signal, as recited in new independent claims 71-72.

Serial No.: 10/775,058  
Docket No.: 104-R001  
Amendment dated April 30, 2007  
Reply to the Office Action of November 30, 2006

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: April 30, 2007  
919 18<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 775-1900  
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Seungman Kim  
Registration No. 50,012